



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/830,020	04/23/2004	Takeshi Saito	251124US2 RD CONT	7663
22850	7590	11/01/2007		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER HYUN, SOON D	
			ART UNIT 2616	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 11/01/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

DETAILED ACTION***Double Patenting***

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 6, 8, 11, 13, 38, 40, 43, and 45 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 6, 10, and 12, of U.S. Patent No. 6,751,221. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 6, 10, and 12 of U.S. Patent Number 6,907,037 encompasses the limitations of claims 6, 8, 11, 13, 38, 40, 43, and 45 of instant application. Moreover, omission of a reference element whose function is not needed would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. It is well settled that the omission of an element and its functions is an obvious expedient if the

Art Unit: 2616

remaining elements performs the same function as before In re Karlson, 163 USPQ 184 (CCPA 1963). Also note Ex parte Rainu, 168 USPQ 375 (Bd. App. 1969).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 6, 8, 38, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being Kujoor et al by U.S. Patent Number 6,021,263.

Re Claims 6 and 38, Kujoor (Fig. 4A) teaches a Destination (a first transmission unit) for transmitting a RES message (a control message) to a Source (receiving node) via path 300 (physical network), wherein the RES message includes an IP address for the Source and QoS requirements (information indicating a required communication resource), whereby the Source sends a query message to the PMD (a network connection device) to determine the ATM traffic descriptors and QoS parameter to setup a SVC connection between the Source and Destination (the path that the information data...path established...an indicated amount of communication resources) wherein the Source (a second transmission unit) transmits the information data

containing the ATM traffic descriptors (channel information) indicating that the resources are reserved (See col. 5 lines 47 +).

Re Claims 8 and 40, refer to Claim 6, wherein ATM supports video and/or digital audio data, wherein the Source inherently includes an encoder for encoding the payload data of video and/or audio data.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 11, 13, 43, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kujoory et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,021,263) in view of Klopfer (U.S. Patent Number 5,790,171).

Re Claims 11 and 43, Kujoory et al teaches (Fig. 4A) teaches a Destination (a first transmission unit) for transmitting a RES message (a control message) to a Source (receiving node) via path 300 (physical network), wherein the RES message includes an IP address for the Source and QoS requirements (information indicating a required communication resource), whereby the Source sends a query message to the PMD (a network connection device) to determine the ATM traffic descriptors and QoS parameter to setup a SVC connection between the Source and Destination (the path that the information data...path established...an indicated amount of communication resources)

Art Unit: 2616

wherein the Source (a second transmission unit) transmits the information data containing the ATM traffic descriptors (channel information) indicating that the resources are reserved (See col. 5, lines 47 +).

However, Kujoory fails to explicitly teach that, "the control message will be in the indicated format".

Klopfers teaches (Fig. 3, an encoder 14 that receives a base-band NTSC format and converts to the MPEG ATM format (See col. 6, lines 65+), wherein the conversion is in accordance with a selected protocol.

One skilled in the art would have been motivated to indicate the format in the control message to be adaptive to different format protocols.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled to combine the references.

Re Claims 13 and 45, refer to Claim 11, wherein MPEG supports video and/or audio data.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Soon D. Hyun whose telephone number is 571-272-3121. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chi H. Pham can be reached on 571-272-3179. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

g

S. Hyun
10/26/2007


CHI PHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

10/29/07